

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated June 6, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-57 are all the claims pending in the application.

**1. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7-10, 13-23, 26-28, 32-35, 38-40 and 47-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5, 359,513 to Kano *et al.* ("Kano"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites an image display method that comprises "performing interimage processing on two original images, constituting each of two or more pairs of original images selected from three or more original images taken of the same subject, which become objects of comparison and reading; and arranging, or switching in sequence, and displaying two or more interimage-processed images generated by said interimage processing."

The Examiner contends that digital image 1 and digital image 2 in Fig. 1B correspond to the claimed two original images. As best understood, the Examiner also contends that the selection of Regions of Interest (ROIs) by the ROI location selector 130 corresponds to the selection of pairs of original images from three or more original images.

The system in Kano is designed to produce a single subtraction image from two original images. (Col. 2, lines 14-19, Figs. 1B, 11A and 11B.) There is no disclosure or suggestion that the pair of images are selected from three or more original images. (See Figs. 1B, 11A and 11B.) The Examiner's reliance on the ROI selector 130 is clearly misplaced.

Kano discloses that a number of small ROIs are selected in the two images to perform image registration in the matching technique prior to image subtraction. (Col. 5, lines 1-22 and lines 48-56.) Each ROI is a matrix of pixels that is, for example, a 32X32 matrix. (See Col. 8, lines 25-36.) In some embodiments, an ROI location selector 130 performs the selection of the ROIs that will later be used for the local matching between the two images. (Col. 12, line 44, to Col. 13, line 19.)

Applicant submits that the ROIs clearly represent portions within the two original images. Therefore, the ROI location selector 130 only selects locations in a portion of the original pair of images. Accordingly, the ROI location selector cannot select pairs of original images from three or more original images as contended by the Examiner.

Therefore, Kano does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed selection of two or more pairs of original images from three or more original images taken of the same subject as set forth in claim 1.

Because independent claims 26 and 55 recite features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1, claims 26 and 55 are patentable for at least reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

## **2. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6, 11, 12, 24, 25, 29-31, 36, 37, 41-46 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kano in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,858,120 to Mori ("Mori"). For at least the following reason, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Because Mori does not cure the deficient teachings of Kano given above with respect to claims 1, 26 and 55, claims 4-6, 11, 12, 24, 25, 29-31, 36, 37, 41-46 and 57 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

**3. New Claims**

Applicant adds claims 58-63 to further protect the invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Susan P. Pan  
Registration No. 41,239

Date: December 5, 2006